

A remark on the short distance potential in gluodynamics

V.I. Shevchenko

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Utrecht University, Leuvenlaan 4
3584 CE Utrecht, the Netherlands*

and

*Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, B.Chermushkinskaya 25
117218 Moscow, Russia*

e-mail: V.Shevchenko@phys.uu.nl

Abstract

The structure of leading nonperturbative corrections to the static Coulomb potential in QCD at small distances is analyzed. We argue in favor of the correction linearly dependent on distance and remark that lattice measurements of static potential for charges in higher representations can distinguish between different phenomenological models explaining its existence. Related problems of validity of Dirac quantization condition for running charges in abelian theory and significance of the quantity $\langle A^2 \rangle$ are briefly discussed.

1 Introduction

Much attention has been given recently to the question about next-to-leading terms for the static potential in confining theory such as QCD at short distances, see [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] and references therein. This problem is closely related to the structure of OPE in confining theories, despite to define the potential one has to go to the large time limit and leave therefore the region of applicability of the standard OPE [7]. In particular, the appearance of new terms in the so called SVZ condensate expansion [8] is discussed [2]. Phenomenologically, the static potential between charge and anticharge is given at small distances as the following expansion

$$V(r) = \frac{c_{-1}}{r} + c_0 + c_1 r + c_2 r^2 + \mathcal{O}(r^3) \quad (1)$$

where the coefficients c_i may also depend on r but only logarithmically. Some typical patterns look as follows

- Abelian charges ($e; -e$) in infinite space beyond tree level

$$c_{-1} = -\frac{e^2(r)}{4\pi} \quad ; \quad c_1 = c_2 = \dots = 0 \quad (2)$$

- Abelian charges ($e; -e$) in the cavity of the size L , tree level [9]

$$c_{-1} = -\frac{e^2}{4\pi} \quad ; \quad c_1 = 0 \quad ; \quad c_i = \gamma_i e^2 L^{-(i+1)} \quad \text{for } i \geq 2 \quad (3)$$

- Nonabelian charges ($gT_D^a; -gT_D^a$) in the representation D of $SU(N)$ interacting with soft nonperturbative fields [10, 11]

$$c_{-1} = -\tilde{\alpha}_s = -C_D (g^2/4\pi) \quad ; \quad c_1 = 0 \quad ; \quad c_2 = \gamma \tilde{\alpha}_s \langle G_{\mu\nu}^a G_{\mu\nu}^a \rangle T_g \quad , \dots \quad (4)$$

where in the last case $\langle G_{\mu\nu}^a G_{\mu\nu}^a \rangle$ is nonperturbative gluon condensate [8] and nonperturbative correlation length T_g characterizes the fall-off of the gauge-invariant two-point correlator of the field strength tensors normalized to the gluon condensate at the origin (see review [13] and references therein). The eigenvalue of quadratic Casimir operator reads as

$$C_D = \text{Tr}_D T_D^a T_D^a \quad ; \quad \text{Tr}_D \mathbf{1}_D = 1 \quad (5)$$

In the expressions above γ 's stay for some dimensionless numerical factors whose values are of no relevance for our discussion. What attracts the attention in all mentioned cases is the absence of linear correction proportional to c_1 . This is also true for another models [12] which we have not included in the list.

However, one cannot propose strong theoretical arguments why c_1 should vanish in the context of QCD or another theory with complicated vacuum structure. Moreover, there are

at least two independent sets of lattice data indicating that $c_1 \neq 0$ [14, 15]. Different models explaining small distance linear correction have been proposed (see [1-6] and references therein). They can be divided into three groups. In the first group there are models [2, 5, 6] which are based on different corrections to the perturbative two-point correlation function - either in the form of gluon propagator $\langle A_\mu^a(x) A_\nu^b(y) \rangle$ or in the form of gauge-invariant path dependent field strength correlator $\langle \text{Tr } G_{\mu\nu}(x) \Phi(x, y) G_{\rho\sigma}(y) \Phi(y, x) \rangle$. The second group is represented by the "dynamical cavity" model [1], which essentially explores (3) but with $L = L(r)$ instead of a constant. Finally, studies of the static potential at small distances in abelian confining theories [3] form the third group. We briefly comment on the latter one at the end of the paper, while our attention is focused on the first and the second groups. The main point of our remark is that despite many common points, it is possible to make distinction on the lattice between models of the first and of the second group by studying the small distance static potential for charges in higher representations of the gauge group.

The paper consists of two relatively independent parts. In the first part (sections 2 and 3) we discuss some elements of short-distance physics in abelian theories. In particular, we present a short review devoted to the following question: does Dirac quantization condition for bare charges $eg = 2\pi$ stay intact when loop effects are included? There have been long discussion of this question in the literature, see [16] and references therein. The affirmative answer is given and physics behind it is explained. We will also point the reader's attention in the section 3 that local average of the square of the photon field $\langle A_\mu(x) A_\mu(x) \rangle$ can be defined in covariant gauge in the context of theory with boundaries.

The second part of the paper (sections 4 and 5) is concentrated on the nonabelian theory. We demonstrate the difference between "dynamical cavity" — like model incorporating Meissner effect, and "modified propagator" — like models in the section 4, which makes it possible to distinguish these scenarios. The section 5 presents our conclusions.

In the rest of the paper unless explicitly stated otherwise, we work in Euclidean space with the notation for the four-vectors $k = (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4)$ and scalar product $kp = k_\mu p^\mu \delta_\nu^\mu$. The three vectors are denoted as $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ and the Wick rotation corresponds to the replacement $k_4 \rightarrow ik_0$.

2 Elements of short-distance physics in Abelian theory with monopoles

Since we are interested in the physics of interactions at small distances, as a warm-up example, we consider here the theory of abelian vector field A_μ interacting with the massive electrically charged matter field and external monopole currents. An integral part of this section is of mini-review type since most of the discussed results can be found in the literature. We believe however that consistent presentation of them can be of some use for the reader.

After integrating matter fields out, the partition function of effective low-energy theory is given by

$$Z[j_\mu^e] = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \int d^d p A_\mu(p) [D^{-1}]_\nu^\mu(p) A^\nu(-p) - S_{eff}[A] + i \int d^d p j_\mu^e(p) A^\mu(-p) \right) \quad (6)$$

where $S_{eff}[A]$ contains interaction terms for the field A_μ . The function $[D^{-1}]_\nu^\mu(p)$ can be decomposed as

$$[D^{-1}]_\nu^\mu(p) = \delta_\nu^\mu d_0(p^2) + p^\mu p_\nu d_1(p^2) \quad (7)$$

where the function $d_1(p)$ is gauge-dependent if the theory in question is a gauge theory. In the latter case the theory can be rewritten in the field-strength formulation [17] as

$$\begin{aligned} Z[j_{\mu\nu}^e] = & \int \mathcal{D}F_{\mu\nu} \delta(\partial_\nu \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{8} \int d^d p F^{\mu\nu}(p) \Delta_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(p) F_{\rho\sigma}(-p) \right) \\ & \cdot \exp \left(-S_{eff}[F] + i \int d^d p j_{\mu\nu}^e(p) F^{\mu\nu}(-p) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta}$ and

$$\Delta_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(p) = (\delta_\mu^\rho \delta_\nu^\sigma - \delta_\mu^\sigma \delta_\nu^\rho) \Delta_0(p^2) + (p_\mu p^\rho \delta_\nu^\sigma - p_\mu p^\sigma \delta_\nu^\rho + p_\nu p^\sigma \delta_\mu^\rho - p_\nu p^\rho \delta_\mu^\sigma) \Delta_1(p^2) \quad (9)$$

The relation

$$d_0(p^2) = p^2 (\Delta_0(p^2) + p^2 \Delta_1(p^2)) \quad (10)$$

provides correlator's matching between the two formulations.

The field strength formulation (8) allows one to introduce monopoles into the theory performing the shift

$$\delta(\partial^\nu \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}) \rightarrow \delta(\partial^\nu \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} - j_\mu^m) \quad (11)$$

If one may neglects $S_{eff}[F]$ (see discussion below), straightforward integration gives the resulting monopole partition function:

$$Z[j_\mu^m, j_{\mu\nu}^e = 0] = \int \mathcal{D}B_\mu \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \int d^d p B_\mu(p) \frac{\delta_\nu^\mu p^2 - p^\mu p_\nu}{\Delta_0(p^2)} B^\nu(-p) + i \int d^d p j_\mu^m(p) B^\mu(-p) \right) \quad (12)$$

For the free theory $d_0(p^2) = p^2$, $\Delta_0(p^2) = 1$, $\Delta_1(p^2) = 0$, which means that (6) coincides with (12) up to the interchange of electric and magnetic currents (charges), in other words pure photodynamics is exactly self-dual. If we switch on the interactions, the inverse propagator gets renormalized and runs with p^2 as $d_0(p^2) = p^2(1 + \Pi(p^2))$ where $\Pi(p^2)$ is the corresponding polarization operator. Let us assume for the time being that the dynamics keeps the gauge invariance of the theory intact, which means, in particular that $\Pi(0) = 0$. When computing the static potential in $d = 3 + 1$ dimensions, one gets formally in the electric case

$$V_{e\bar{e}}(r) = -e^2 \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{d_0(\mathbf{p}^2)} \exp(i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{r}) \quad (13)$$

while corresponding expression in the magnetic case reads

$$V_{m\bar{m}}(r) = -g^2 \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d_0(\mathbf{p}^2)}{\mathbf{p}^4} \exp(i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{r}) \quad (14)$$

where the charges e, g are physical renormalized (but not running) charges and $r = |\mathbf{r}|$.

It is seen from (13), (14) that the leading corrections to the Coulomb potential have different signs in electric and magnetic cases:

$$\frac{1}{e^2} \delta V_{e\bar{e}}(r) = -\frac{1}{g^2} \delta V_{m\bar{m}}(r) = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\Pi(\mathbf{p}^2)}{\mathbf{p}^2} \exp(i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{r}) \quad (15)$$

Sometimes this is considered as a proof¹ of the fact that Dirac quantization condition $eg = 2\pi n$ holds also for running charges (see discussion and further references in [16]) if it does for the bare charges:

$$e_0 g_0 = eg = e(r)g(r) = 2\pi n \quad (16)$$

where $e_0, e, e(r)$ denote the bare, the renormalized and the running charge, respectively. The situation is much more subtle, however. To be more concrete let us take the best studied case of spinor electrodynamics as an example. The problem is that introducing monopoles by (11) one sets the scale of magnetic fields by the large coupling $g \sim 1/e$, since j_μ^m contains factor $g \gg 1$. As an immediate result, all higher order irreducible correlators of magnetic fields interacting with the electrically charged matter field described by S_{eff} can play a role. One should distinguish three different kinematical regions. For large distances $rm \gg 1$, where m is electron mass the corrections to the static potential are exponentially damped with r for both $V_{e\bar{e}}(r)$ and $V_{m\bar{m}}(r)$. Of main interest is the small distance region $rm \ll 1$. The leading term in the k -point irreducible vertex in S_{eff} contributing to the monopole potential (14) at small distances contains the factor $g^k e^k = (2\pi n)^k$ while the analogous contribution to (13) is suppressed as $e^k e^k = e^{2k} \ll 1$. On the other hand the $k > 4$ correlators describing the processes of multi-photon scattering do not have² contributions logarithmically rising with p^2 . It means that for large p^2 and not too large value of the product eg one can indeed take the one-loop result (15) as a correct first approximation. With the product eg getting large, however, higher order terms in the non-Gaussian part S_{eff} are becoming more and more important and their effect might overcome the leading kinematical one-loop logarithm and spoil (16). However, this is not what happens. Since the effective Lagrangian is formed in this case at the distances $l \sim r/\sqrt{eg}$ which are for $eg \gg 1$ smaller than the typical scale of the field change r (see, e.g. [18, 19]), the constant field approximation can be used. The Lagrangian in constant magnetic field is given (we use Minkowskii metric conventions here) at the first order by the following expression [20]

$$L = -\frac{\mathbf{H}^2}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\pi} \log \frac{e\mathbf{H}}{m^2} \right) \quad (17)$$

¹Actually only at the next-to-leading order in electric coupling e^2 , which is assumed to be a small parameter. Notice that $\Pi(p^2)$ is $\mathcal{O}(e^2)$.

²As is well known, at $k = 4$ the amplitude formally diverges logarithmically, but this divergence is exactly cancelled in the sum of all diagrams

where $4\pi\alpha = e^2$ and $H = |\mathbf{H}|$. Since the point-like magnetic charge is defined microscopically via divergence of $\mathbf{H}$, $\text{div } \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{r}) = g \cdot \delta(\mathbf{r})$, one gets from (17) for the running magnetic charge with logarithmic accuracy

$$g(r) = g \left[1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\pi} \log \frac{1}{(mr)^2} \right] \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, point-like electric charge is defined via Maxwell's equation $\text{div } \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}) = e \cdot \delta(\mathbf{r})$ where $\mathbf{D} = \partial L / \partial \mathbf{E}$, which leads to the standard Uehling-Serber result [21] (again with logarithmic accuracy)

$$e(r) = e \left[1 + \frac{\alpha}{3\pi} \log \frac{1}{(mr)^2} \right] \quad (19)$$

This is precisely the same answer one can get from (15) with the standard one-loop expression for $\Pi(\mathbf{p}^2)$.

At first glance the coincidence between (15) and (18), (19) seems rather surprising since the latter two expressions were obtained from the exact strong field Lagrangian (17) which sums up infinite number of graphs while the former one is a trivial outcome of Gaussian integrations with one-loop two-point function. The reason for this result is the remarkable correspondence between QED at small distances and QED in strong fields, studied in the series of papers [19]. It follows directly from the minimal coupling principle for the gauge and charged matter fields: $p_\mu \rightarrow P_\mu = p_\mu - eA_\mu$ which gives a hint that large p_μ and large eA_μ can describe one and the same physics. The above example shows rather nontrivial manifestation of this correspondence. It is worth saying that the transition from one-loop dominated regime (15) to truly nonperturbative one (17) at fixed distance r with the increasing of $n = \frac{eg}{2\pi}$ is a physical phenomenon, not related to any formal redefinitions of coupling constants etc. Notice also that no topological objects like Dirac strings have been involved in our analysis. Unfortunately, up to the author's knowledge there still exists no rigorous proof of (16) in QED in all orders of the electric coupling and/or beyond logarithmic accuracy.

If $\tilde{\Pi}(p^2) \equiv p^2 \Pi(p^2)$ does not vanish when $p^2 \rightarrow 0$, the theory leaves Coulomb phase and one cannot introduce external monopoles simply by (11). A well known example of such theory is given by abelian Higgs model where the electrically charged field is condensed:

$$L = \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} |D_\mu \phi|^2 + \lambda (|\phi|^2 - \eta^2)^2 \quad (20)$$

Attempts to write down exact expression for the confining potential in this theory encounter a serious problem. The reason for that is the physical one: since the confining string is created between the particles (external monopole-antimonopole pair), its quantum dynamics should be properly taken into account. The confining interaction can not therefore be described in terms of particle exchanges. Moreover, even in effective abelian theory framework there exists no consistent procedure to perform corresponding stringy calculations analytically at the moment. The best one can do is to compute the Wilson loop for a particular choice of the confining string world-sheet geometry. The conventional choice is the minimal surface S for the given contour C , the flat one if the contour is rectangular (as it is for the static potential). In the

London limit the Higgs boson is much heavier than the vector boson, $m_H \gg m = e\eta$ and such defined potential reads in this limit (see, e.g. [22]):

$$V_{m\bar{m}}^{[S]}(r) = g^2 \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int d^4x \int d^4y \left(\frac{1}{4} \Sigma_{\mu\nu}(x) \Delta_m(x-y) \Sigma_{\mu\nu}(y) \right) - g^2 \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\exp(i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{r})}{\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2} \quad (21)$$

where the surface current $\Sigma_{\mu\nu}(x)$ and the kernel $\Delta_m(x-y)$ are given by the expressions

$$\Sigma_{\mu\nu}(x) = \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\nu}(\xi) \delta^{(4)}(x(\xi) - x) \quad ; \quad \Delta_m(x) = \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{m^2}{p^2 + m^2} \exp(ipx) \quad (22)$$

We have indicated by superscript^[S] that the potential depends on the profile of the string chosen in (22). At large distances $rm \gg 1$ the potential (21) has linear asymptotics and describes confinement.

We are to address the question of applicability of (21) at small distances. Obviously, the expression (21) breaks down at $r \lesssim m_H^{-1}$ since at such small distances the scalar field condensate gets excited and virtual loops of scalar particles contribute to the polarization of the vacuum. If one takes (20) as some low energy effective theory, the ultraviolet cut-off implicitly enters through higher-dimensional operators. Moreover, if the Higgs boson in this effective theory is composite in terms of underlying microscopic theory degrees of freedom, the vector bosons with the energy higher than the corresponding binding energy start to resolve the constituents. In any of these cases the potential (21) gets modified. Let us consider the simplest possible modification which is to replace m^2 in (21), (22) into vector boson self-energy $\tilde{\Pi}(p^2)$ such that $\tilde{\Pi}(0) = m^2$. Such replacements is in line with (13), (14) and can be justified³ in terms of perturbation theory in the electric coupling e . Needless to say that the high-momentum asymptotics of $\tilde{\Pi}(p^2)$ will be different for different microscopic scenarios outlined above.

The leading short-distance contribution to (21) is attractive Coulomb potential while there are two kinds of sub-leading corrections:

$$V_{m\bar{m}}^{[r \times T]}(r) = -\frac{g^2}{4\pi r} + \delta V_{m\bar{m}}^{(1)}(r) + \delta V_{m\bar{m}}^{(2)}(r) + \mathcal{O}(g^2 e^4) \quad (23)$$

The second correction term comes from the second Yukawa-like term in (21) and formally reads as

$$\frac{1}{g^2} \delta V_{m\bar{m}}^{(2)}(r) = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\tilde{\Pi}(\mathbf{p}^2)}{\mathbf{p}^4} \exp(i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{r}) \quad (24)$$

The low - $\mathbf{p}^2$ divergence is artificial and can be easily regularized. The first term in (21) produces the following correction

$$\frac{1}{g^2} \delta V_{m\bar{m}}^{(1)}(r) = r \cdot \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\tilde{\Pi}\left(\frac{\mathbf{k}^2}{r^2}\right)}{\mathbf{k}^2} \left(\frac{4 \sin^2\left(\frac{k_3}{2}\right)}{(k_3)^2} \right) \quad (25)$$

³Of course, $\tilde{\Pi}(0) = 0$ in the perturbative QED context

where for convenience we put the Wilson contour in the $(3, 4)$ plane. It is seen that the dependence of the confining term - induced correction (25) on r is completely determined by the behavior of $\tilde{\Pi}(p^2)$ as a function of p^2 . In particular, if $\tilde{\Pi}(p^2)$ is such that the r - dependence of the integral is weak enough, the correction to the potential will be approximately linear. If $\tilde{\Pi}(p^2) \equiv m^2$, the Yukawa-like correction is linear in r and negative: $\delta V_{m\bar{m}}^{(2)}(r) = -(g^2 m^2 r)/(8\pi)$ (we have omitted irrelevant constant term). This is the only correction (up to the change $g \rightarrow e$) one would get for the static electric charges without taking into account the string dynamics. The "confining" correction (25) is positive in this case, but logarithmically divergent in the ultraviolet region. This divergence is to be cured if the correct form of $\tilde{\Pi}(p^2)$ in high-momentum regime is taken. Presumably, the relative minus sign between $\delta V_{m\bar{m}}^{(1)}(r)$ and $\delta V_{m\bar{m}}^{(2)}(r)$ persists in this case as well.

It is worth to put an emphasis on the fact that the physics behind $\delta V_{m\bar{m}}^{(1)}(r)$ and $\delta V_{m\bar{m}}^{(2)}(r)$ is very different. In a sense, the former one describes the process of string tension formation, which starts essentially at some ultraviolet scale in this model and goes all the way up to the distance scale given by m^{-1} . Since the corresponding formation "speed" is only logarithmic, one can have indeed approximately linear potential at small distances - "ultraviolet confinement", the phenomenon which apparently goes beyond the conventional OPE.

3 Comment on the quantity $\langle A^2 \rangle$

The linear correction to the potential imply the existence of local $d = 2$ parameter in the theory proportional to c_1 . It cannot be local polynomial function of original fields of the theory since the only dimension two candidate, average of vector potential squared $\langle \text{Tr } A_\mu(x)^2 \rangle$ is not gauge-invariant. Moreover, there is a gauge, defined by infinitesimal transformation $U(x) = 1 + igA_\mu(x_0)(x - x_0)^\mu + \dots$, such that ${}^U A_\mu^a(x_0) = 0$, i.e. one always has locally

$$\left\langle \min_{U \in G} \left({}^U A_\mu^a(x) \right)^2 \right\rangle = 0 \quad (26)$$

where G is the gauge group, for abelian or nonabelian theory. In abelian case, however, the minimum of integral of $\langle A_\mu(x)^2 \rangle$ over the whole space can be rewritten in terms of gauge-invariant quantities [23]. The physical relevance of such nonlocal object for nonabelian case is under debate [24, 25].

We would like to point the reader's attention to the fact, that despite it seems to be impossible to assign any gauge-invariant meaning to the local quantity $\langle A^2 \rangle$, one can have in some cases ξ -independent definition of $\langle A^2 \rangle$, where ξ is the covariant gauge fixing parameter. It happens when one studies the theories which contain some external parameter of the dimension of mass/length and if the part of the effective action depending on this parameter does not depend on ξ . By way of example let us study photodynamics with the Casimir-type static

boundary conditions (see review [26] and references therein):

$$Z[j_\mu^e] = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \delta[BC] \exp \left(- \int d^d x \left(\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}(x) F^{\mu\nu}(x) + \frac{1}{2\xi} (\partial_\mu A_\nu(x))^2 + i j_\mu^e(x) A^\mu(x) \right) \right) \quad (27)$$

where the boundary conditions read as

$$\delta[BC] = \delta(n_\mu \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}(x_1, x_2, x_3 = a_1, x_4)) \delta(n_\mu \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}(x_1, x_2, x_3 = a_2, x_4))$$

Here $n_\mu = (0, 0, 1, 0)$ is a unit vector in the x_3 -direction and a_1, a_2 mark the x_3 - positions of parallel infinitely thin ideally conducting plates. The distance between plates is given by $a = |a_2 - a_1|$.

The gauge field propagator can be readily obtained from (27), it consists of two parts:

$$\langle A_\mu(x) A_\nu(y) \rangle = D_{\mu\nu}(x, y) = D_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}(x - y; \xi) + \bar{D}_{\mu\nu}(x, y; a_1, a_2)$$

where the term $D_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}(x - y; \xi)$ is the standard gauge-dependent tree-level photon propagator, while the term $\bar{D}_{\mu\nu}(x, y; a_1, a_2)$ encodes the information about the boundaries. The exact form of the latter was first obtained in [27]. The function $D_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}(x - y; \xi)$ is translation-invariant but gauge-dependent, while the function $\bar{D}_{\mu\nu}(x, y; a_1, a_2)$ depends on x_3 and y_3 separately, but is ξ -independent (not to be confused with the gauge-invariance!). Moreover, it has finite limit when x approaches y . Therefore one can address the issue of the $\langle A_\mu(x) A^\mu(x) \rangle$ condensate in the Casimir vacuum exactly in the same way one computes the energy density in this problem, namely, subtracting the boundary-independent part:

$$\langle A^2(x) \rangle \stackrel{def}{=} \lim_{y \rightarrow x} \left(\langle A_\mu(x) A^\mu(y) \rangle - \langle A_\mu(x) A^\mu(y) \rangle^{(0)} \right) = \bar{D}_\mu^\mu(x, x; a_1, a_2) \quad (28)$$

It is convenient to introduce the notation $z = a_1 + a_2 - 2x_3$. When, using exact expression for $\bar{D}_{\mu\nu}(x, y; a_1, a_2)$ one gets:

$$\langle A^2(z) \rangle = \frac{1}{12a^2} \left[1 + \frac{3}{2} \tan^2 \left(\frac{\pi z}{2a} \right) \right] \quad (29)$$

Such defined local dimension two "condensate" is ξ -independent, strictly positive and diverges on the boundaries. In completely analogous way one can define $\langle A^2 \rangle$ - "condensate" at finite temperature.

In the context of Casimir problem one is usually interested to study the changes of physical quantities like components of energy-momentum tensor with respect to their vacuum values. The above example demonstrates that "non-physical" quantity like $\langle A^2 \rangle$ is also nontrivially modified. It is worth noting that (29) is not related to any linear correction to the potential - the potential for dipole between the mirrors is of the form (3) with $L = a$.

4 "Dynamical cavity" vs "modified propagator"

One of the main assumptions of the SVZ framework can be formulated as a wordplay: the nonperturbative vacuum of the theory is not perturbed by the external sources. In case of large

virtualities it is sometimes justified using the language of condensed matter physics: since the time scale of the hard process we wish to study is much smaller than typical relaxation times characterizing such a medium as nonperturbative QCD vacuum, it is reasonable to suggest that the vacuum state remains unchanged.

It is of interest to relax this assumption and to study the corresponding physics. An example of the situation where one has to do it is provided by the monopole-antimonopole pair in the superconductor. It is well known that the condensate must be broken along some line connecting the particles, whatever small their charge is (see review [16] and references therein). The reason for that, eventually, is the nonperturbative nature of the interaction between magnetic and electric particles.

First, we re-derive the results of "dynamical cavity" model [1] in more quantitative way. After that, we will come to the "modified propagator" model [2]. Since we consider gluodynamics in this section, we switch to dual terminology, so that particles which are confined (quarks) carry *electric* and not magnetic charge. The microscopic description of confinement as dual Meissner effect via monopole condensation refers to the abelian projection procedure [28]. We adopt the physical picture of confinement as dual Meissner effect but will make no use of the abelian Higgs model-motivated language in this section. As it is well known the energy density of nonperturbative fields is given by the energy-momentum tensor trace anomaly [29]

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{4} \langle \theta_{\mu\mu} \rangle = \frac{\beta(\alpha_s)}{16\alpha_s} \langle G_{\mu\nu}^a(0) G_{\mu\nu}^a(0) \rangle \quad (30)$$

where

$$\beta(\alpha_s) = \mu^2 \frac{d\alpha_s(\mu^2)}{d\mu^2} = - \left(\frac{11}{3} N - \frac{2}{3} N_f \right) \frac{\alpha_s^2}{2\pi} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3) \quad (31)$$

In principle the average (30) depends on the actual state of the system, for example, one can study its density or temperature dependence. In terms of invariant functions $D(z^2)$ and $D_1(z^2)$ the vacuum gluon condensate is given as [10]

$$\langle g^2 \text{Tr } G_{\mu\nu}(0) G_{\mu\nu}(0) \rangle = 24(D(0) + D_1(0)) \quad (32)$$

where only the function $D(z^2)$ is responsible for confinement. In particular, the deconfinement transition is characterized by the condition $D(z^2) \equiv 0$, with the smooth behavior of $D_1(z)$ over the phase transition [30].

One can rise a question what happens to (30) in color field of external source. Owing to $SU(3)$ and $O(4)$ invariance, such average can be defined as

$$G_2(\mathbf{r}) = \left\langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} G_{\mu\nu}^a(\mathbf{r}) G_{\mu\nu}^a(\mathbf{r}) \right\rangle = \frac{g^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{\langle \text{Tr } (G_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{r}) G_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{r})) \cdot \text{Tr } \text{P exp } i \int_C A_\rho dz_\rho \rangle}{\langle \text{Tr } \text{P exp } i \int_C A_\rho dz_\rho \rangle} \quad (33)$$

where C stays for the (closed) world-line of the source. If the point $\mathbf{r}$ is far enough from C , the average reaches the vacuum value: $G_2(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow G_2$. Correspondingly, one defines $\epsilon(\mathbf{r}) = \epsilon(\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}))$

via (30). To the best of author's knowledge, no systematic lattice analysis of behavior of $\epsilon(\mathbf{r})$ in the strong external field has been performed. This problem is of direct relevance for our discussion. Namely, let us put a single static charge in the nonperturbative QCD vacuum. Due to confinement property there should be an anti-charge somewhere in the space to end the confining string and therefore the field distribution will not be spherically symmetric. Suppose, however, that we look at the gluon fields in a thin spherical layer between r and $r + \Delta r$, where r is smaller than the typical nonperturbative nonlocality scale given by T_g (it is worth mentioning that the same quantity T_g defines the width of the confining string). Then it is natural to assume that the Faraday flux lines of the charge are affected only weakly by the opposite charge sitting on the other end of the string. On the other hand, they are affected by the nonperturbative vacuum and act back on it. Correspondingly, we take the energy of the gluon fields as a sum of perturbative and nonperturbative parts

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_p + \mathcal{E}_{np} = \frac{1}{2} \int_V d^3\mathbf{r} \mathbf{E}^a(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{E}^a(\mathbf{r}) + \int_V d^3\mathbf{r} \epsilon(\mathbf{r}) \quad (34)$$

where $\mathbf{E}^a(\mathbf{r})$ is the perturbative electric field of the charge. In principle, the coordinate dependence of $\mathbf{E}^a(\mathbf{r})$ and $\epsilon(\mathbf{r}) = \epsilon(\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}))$ on $\mathbf{r}$ can be very complex, resembling the formation of intermediate state in the vicinity of the charge, like it happens in ordinary superconductors. It can be energetically advantageous to squeeze slightly perturbative flux lines at one part of the volume⁴ and to rarefy them in the rest of it (this increases the first term in (34)) but compensate the excess of energy by the nonperturbative energy gain from the rest of the volume, which can be possible if $\epsilon(\mathbf{r})$ decreases towards its vacuum value when $\mathbf{E}^a(\mathbf{r})$ decreases in this part of the volume. This is the essence of Meissner effect. Let us simplify the matter further by approximating (34) as

$$\Delta\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2} \left[C_D \left(\frac{g}{4\pi r^2} \right)^2 \right] \cdot \left(\frac{4\pi r^2}{S_1(r)} \right)^2 \cdot S_1(r) \Delta r + \epsilon_1 \cdot S_1(r) \Delta r + \epsilon_2 \cdot S_2(r) \Delta r + \mathcal{O}(\Delta r^2) \quad (35)$$

We have taken $\epsilon(\mathbf{r})$ as constants ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 in the parts of the volume $S_1 \Delta r$ and $S_2 \Delta r$, respectively. Notice that $S_1(r) + S_2(r) = 4\pi r^2$. The expression (35) assumes that the parts of the space occupied by the nonperturbative fields with the (vacuum) energy density ϵ_2 completely expel the perturbative field flux lines into the regions where the energy density of nonperturbative fields is given by ϵ_1 . The rescaling of electric perturbative field of the point charge reflect the flux conservation.

Since $S_1(r)$ can be never greater than $4\pi r^2$, there exists critical radius (corresponding to the stationary point of (35))

$$r_c^4 = \frac{\tilde{\alpha}_s}{8\pi(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)} \quad (36)$$

When r reaches r_c from above, the region of unperturbed vacuum S_2 shrinks to zero. Physically the model describes the formation of a bag of the radius r_c , there perturbative fields are strong

⁴Since we are working at small distances, the total perturbative flux (i.e. the number of the flux lines) is conserved. More accurately, because of asymptotic freedom it is not, but its violation due to asymptotic freedom is weak logarithmic effect

enough to change the nonperturbative vacuum state significantly. We are not addressing an interesting question at the moment, is there local deconfinement transition (in any sense of the word) in this volume (what is natural to think of being based on abelian Meissner effect analogy). Let us estimate r_c numerically. We use different sets of data [31] and take for the gluon condensate

$$G_2 = \left\langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} G_{\mu\nu}^a G_{\mu\nu}^a \right\rangle = (0.014 \div 0.026) \text{GeV}^4 \quad (37)$$

Hence for the nonperturbative vacuum energy in one loop choosing $N = 3$, $N_f = 2$ we obtain

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2 = \kappa\epsilon - \epsilon = (1 - \kappa) \cdot (4 \div 8) \cdot 10^{-3} \text{GeV}^4 \quad (38)$$

The value of the positive factor $\kappa = \epsilon_1/\epsilon_2 < 1$ is unknown and enters as free parameter. Taking $\tilde{\alpha}_s = 0.47$ (corresponding to the charges in fundamental representation and $\alpha_s(M_\tau)$), we finally get

$$r_c = (1 - \kappa)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \cdot (0.2 \div 0.3) \text{Fm} \quad (39)$$

Unless κ is unnaturally close to unity this rather small value of r_c is compatible with the discussed picture - had it been much larger than T_g , the analysis would be meaningless.

Let us, following [1], consider now a small color dipole of the size R . The expression for the energy (34) stays intact, but the physics of critical distance r_c is different. Since there is no flux of perturbative field through the surface of the volume with the dipole inside, it is advantageous to confine flux lines inside some finite volume. Suppose that we have chosen the volume of some fixed size $L \gtrsim R$ around the dipole, such that vacuum energy density $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon$ outside is reduced to $\epsilon_1 > \epsilon_2$ inside it. The perturbative electric field felt on the boundary of this volume is proportional to R/L^3 . It is important that it goes to zero when R decreases. It means that making R small enough the total energy can also be lowered by appropriate decreasing of L , i.e. $L = L(R)$. Indeed, when we go from L to $L - \Delta L$ the perturbative energy increase due to the rearrangement of perturbative field is given by

$$\Delta\mathcal{E}_p = \frac{1}{2}C_D \left(\frac{g}{4\pi} \right)^2 \int_{L-\Delta L}^L d^3\mathbf{r} \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}^2}{\mathbf{r}^6} + 3 \frac{(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{r})^2}{\mathbf{r}^8} \right) = \tilde{\alpha}_s \frac{R^2}{L^4} \Delta L + \mathcal{O}(\Delta L^2) \quad (40)$$

while the nonperturbative energy gain is

$$\Delta\mathcal{E}_{np} = 4\pi L^2(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)\Delta L + \mathcal{O}(\Delta L^2) \quad (41)$$

This defines the stationary point

$$L_c = \left(\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_s R^2}{4\pi(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)} \right)^{1/6} \quad (42)$$

We can now estimate the nonperturbative correction to the energy of the dipole as

$$\delta\mathcal{E}(R) \approx \tilde{\alpha}_s \frac{R^2}{3L_c^3} + (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) \cdot \frac{4\pi}{3} L_c^3 = \frac{4}{3} \cdot \sqrt{\pi \tilde{\alpha}_s (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)} \cdot R \quad (43)$$

This correction is linear in R , as one can alternatively see inserting (42) into (3). Numerically we get

$$\frac{4}{3} \cdot \sqrt{\pi \tilde{\alpha}_s (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)} = (1 - \kappa)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (0.10 \div 0.14) \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (44)$$

The discussed picture reminds the old MIT bag model [32]. This similarity is formal, in some sense. While in the MIT bag model the bag has the typical hadron size, the "dynamical cavity" of the size $L_c(R)$ given by (42) is an object, which has physical meaning only at the very small distances. Since $L_c \sim R^{1/3}$, at small enough R we are always in $T_g \gtrsim L_c \gtrsim R$ regime, where all the picture is meaningful. With R and L_c rising and reaching T_g , the confining string formation process starts and we leave the domain of qualitative applicability of the model.

We can now come to the "modified propagator" models [2, 5, 6]. Actually, their analysis is simpler and we take as an example the model of [2]. It is suggested to modify the one-gluon exchange propagator by adding "tachyon" mass term to the gluon, i.e. (in Minkowskii metric and Feynman gauge)

$$\langle A_\mu^a(k) A_\nu^b(-k) \rangle = \eta_{\mu\nu} \delta^{ab} \frac{1}{k^2} \rightarrow \eta_{\mu\nu} \delta^{ab} \left(\frac{1}{k^2} + \frac{\lambda^2}{k^4} \right) \quad (45)$$

Notice that (45) is large momentum expansion so one actually never gets closer to the artificial "tachyon pole". The analysis of existing phenomenology leads to $\lambda^2 \approx -0.5 \text{ GeV}^2$ estimate for the "tachyon mass" [2]. However the physical origin of the λ^2 -term in the context of QCD has not been clarified. Alternative scenarios suggest μ^2/z^2 -contribution⁵ to the function $D_1(z^2)$ [5], strong coupling constant freezing [6], infrared renormalons [1]. It is easy to see that all these proposals lead to the Casimir scaling law for the corresponding correction, for example, with expression (45) one gets

$$(46)$$

$$V_D(r) + \text{const} = -\tilde{\alpha}_s \cdot \left(\frac{1}{r} + \frac{\lambda^2 r}{2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(r^2) \quad (47)$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}_s = C_D \alpha_s = C_D (g^2/4\pi)$, i.e. $V_D(r) \sim C_D$.

The magnitude of corrections are close to each other in both models, for example taking value (44) one gets in terms of (45) $\lambda^2 = -(1 - \kappa)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (0.4 \div 0.6) \text{ GeV}^2$ which is surprisingly close to the value found in [2]. The important difference, however is different C_D -dependence. The remarkable property of (43) is its square root dependence on the eigenvalue of Casimir operator C_D . This result is known in the context of MIT bag model [33], where it takes place for the slope of confining linear potential. As such, square root law was definitely ruled out by precise recent studies of static potential at large distances in different representations of the gauge group [34, 35]. Instead, the Casimir scaling phenomenon (proportionality of $V_D(r)$ to C_D) was confirmed (see [36] for review). However there exist no calculations of static potential

⁵It can be shown that $1/z^2$ term in the function $D(z^2)$ would produce ultraviolet divergence on the world-sheet of the confining string, while such term in $D_1(z^2)$ is safe.

for charges in higher representations at small distances . Such lattice simulation will confront in nontrivial way (43) and (47).

From general point of view the Casimir scaling and $\sqrt{C_D}$ law for the leading small distance correction would correspond to rather different physical pictures. Both cases physically describe perturbative-nonperturbative interference and require modification of the standard "condensate ideology" in QCD. However in the latter case this modification is to be by far more radical. Roughly speaking, the former case corresponds to a new kind of nonperturbative corrections to the perturbative propagator, which are "harder" than those studied before, while the latter case indicates that the nonperturbative vacuum structure itself is strongly affected by the perturbative field when it reaches some critical value.

To be self-contained, let us briefly mention the analysis of classical abelian Higgs model on the shortest distances, performed in [3]. The small distance correction to the potential was found numerically and fitted by linear function with a good accuracy. This behavior was linked to the Dirac veto, i.e. the condition for the charged condensate ϕ to vanish along some line (the Dirac string) between the dual charges. The problem mentioned in the section 2 still persists in this case, because the position of the Dirac string can be chosen in arbitrary way and the answer for the short distance potential depends on this choice. Moreover, it is not quite clear what the Dirac string of effective abelian theory does correspond to in terms of the original nonabelian theory. In "dynamical cavity" model the linear behavior (43) also results from the Meissner effect but without any special role of singularities like Dirac strings. Roughly speaking, the effect in [3] comes from the infinitely thin line between the charges, while in the discussed case all the volume of the size L_c contributes to it.

5 Conclusion

There are a few models in the literature aimed to reproduce the linear dependence with distance of the leading nonperturbative correction to the static potential at small distances. Comparing different models we call the reader's attention to the fact, that possible way to put them on test is to check the dependence of this correction on the quadratic Casimir for higher representations of the charges. Such computation can shed new light on strong interaction physics and the problem of confinement.

Acknowledgments

The author is thankful to the foundation "Fundamenteel Onderzoek der Materie" (FOM), which is financially supported by the Dutch National Science Foundation (NWO). The support from the grants RFFI-00-02-17836, RFFI-01-02-06284 and from the grant INTAS 00-110 is also acknowledged.

References

- [1] R. Akhoury, V.I. Zakharov, Phys.Lett. **B438** (1998) 165
- [2] K.G. Chetyrkin, S. Narison, V.I. Zakharov, Nucl.Phys. **B550** (1999) 353
- [3] M.N. Chernodub, F.V. Gubarev, M.I. Polikarpov, V.I. Zakharov, Phys.Lett. **B475** (2000) 303; F.V. Gubarev, M.I. Polikarpov, V.I. Zakharov, Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl. **86** (2000) 437
- [4] F.V. Gubarev, M.I. Polikarpov, V.I. Zakharov, hep-th/9812030
- [5] Yu.A. Simonov, JETP Lett. **69** (1999) 505; Yu.A. Simonov Phys.Rept. **320** (1999) 265
- [6] A.M. Badalian, D.S. Kuzmenko, Phys.Rev. **D65** (2002) 016004
- [7] K.G. Wilson, Phys.Rev. **179** (1969) 1499; Phys.Rev **D3** (1971) 1818; K.G. Wilson and J.Kogut, Phys.Rept. **12** (1974) 75
- [8] M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein and V.Zakharov, Nucl.Phys. **B147** (1979) 385; 448
- [9] H.B.G. Casimir, D.Polder, Phys.Rev. **73** (1948) 360
- [10] H.G.Dosch, Phys. Lett. **B190** (1987) 177; H.G.Dosch and Yu.A.Simonov, Phys. Lett. **B205** (1988) 339; Yu.A.Simonov, Nucl. Phys. **B307** (1988) 512
- [11] Yu.A. Simonov, S. Titard, F.J. Yndurain, Phys.Lett. **B354** (1995) 435
- [12] M.B. Voloshin, Nucl.Phys. **B154** (1979) 365; H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. **B98** (1981) 447; J.S. Bell, R.A.Bertlmann, Nucl.Phys. **B187** (1981) 285; I.I. Balitsky, Nucl.Phys. **B254** (1985) 166
- [13] A.Di Giacomo, H.G.Dosch, V.I.Shevchenko, Yu.A.Simonov, Phys.Rept. **372** (2002) 319
- [14] G. Burgio, F. Di Renzo, G. Marchesini, E. Onofri, Phys.Lett. **B422** (1998) 219
- [15] G.S. Bali, Phys.Lett. **B460** (1999) 170
- [16] M.N. Chernodub, F.V. Gubarev, M.I. Polikarpov, V.I. Zakharov, Phys.Atom.Nucl. **64** (2001) 561
- [17] M. Halpern, Phys.Rev. **D19** (1979) 517
- [18] G.J. Goebel, M.T. Thomas, Phys.Rev. **D30** (1984) 823
- [19] V.I. Ritus, Sov. Phys. JETP, **42** (1975) 774; V.I. Ritus, Sov. Phys. JETP, **46** (1977) 423; V.I. Ritus, hep-th/9812124
- [20] W. Heisenberg, H.Euler, Z.Phys. **98** (1936) 714

- [21] R. Serber, Phys.Rev. **48** (1935) 49; E. Uehling, Phys.Rev. **48** (1935) 55
- [22] E. Akhmedov, M.Chernodub, M. Polikarpov, M. Zubkov, Phys.Rev **D53** (1996) 2087
- [23] F.V. Gubarev, L. Stodolsky, V.I. Zakharov, Phys.Rev.Lett. **86** (2001) 2220; F.V. Gubarev, V.I. Zakharov, Phys.Lett. **B501** (2001) 28
- [24] M.J. Lavelle, M. Schaden, Phys.Lett. **B208** (1988) 297
- [25] P. Boucaud, A. Le Yaouanc, J.P. Leroy, J. Micheli, O. Pene, J. Rodriguez-Quintero, Phys.Lett. **B493** (2000) 315; L. Stodolsky, P.van Baal, V.I. Zakharov, Phys.Lett. **B552** (2003) 214
- [26] M. Bordag, U. Mohideen, V.M. Mostepanenko, Phys.Rept. **353** (2001) 1
- [27] M. Bordag, D. Robaschik, E. Wieczorek, Ann.Phys. (NY) **165** (1985) 192
- [28] G. 't Hooft, Nucl.Phys. **B138** (1978) 1
- [29] J. Collins, A. Duncan, S. Joglekar, Phys.Rev. **D16** (1977) 438
- [30] A.Di Giacomo, M.D'Elia, H.Panagopoulos, E.Meggiolaro, hep-lat/9808056
- [31] M.D'Elia, A.Di Giacomo, E.Meggiolaro, Phys.Lett. **B408** (1997) 315; S.Narison, Phys.Lett. **B387** (1996) 162
- [32] A. Chodos, R.L. Jaffe, K. Johnson, C.B. Thorn, V.F. Weisskopf, *Phys. Rev.* **D 9** (1974) 3471
- [33] K.Johnson and C.B.Thorn, Phys. Rev. **D13** (1976) 1934 ; T.H.Hansson, Phys.Lett. **B166** (1986) 343
- [34] G. S. Bali, Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl. **83** (2000) 422; G.S. Bali, Phys.Rev. **D62** (2000) 114503 (2000)
- [35] S.Deldar, Phys.Rev. **D62** (2000) 034509; S.Deldar, Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl. **73** (1999) 587 (1999)
- [36] V.Shevchenko, Yu.Simonov, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **A18** (2003) 127